

Board of Studies (BoS) – 9. meeting 2023

9 November 2023

Present: **Signe Louise Yndigegn** (faculty, SAT DD), **Irina Papazu** (faculty, SAT Business), **Magnus Borum Green** (student, SAT DD), **Theodor Christian Kier** (directly elected student), **Ea Feldfos** (assigned guest, SAP), **Christian Balslev van Randwijk** (secretary to BoS, SAP), **Lena Winther Jensen** (student, SAT CS)

Guests: **Viktorija Hofbauer** (SAP/DoES), **Pernille Hvalsøe** (LS), **Alaa Imad Abdul-AI** (student), **Emdah Habib** (student), **Joachim Kofoed** (student)

Absent: **Hanna Wirman** (faculty, SAT Games), **Pernille Rydén** (assigned guest, Dean of Education), **Marco Carbone** (faculty, SAT CS), **Clovis A.V. Lebret** (student, SAT Games), **Fie Crusell Pedersen** (student, SAT BIT)

Agenda

1. Approval of agenda

2. Presentation: *“ProjectIT: An Innovative Web Platform Designed to Streamline the Collaboration Between Students and Supervisors for The Final Year’s Project”*.

A group of students will demonstrate a new platform they have developed.

3. Undervisningspris 2024 (Closed item)

4. GAI Guidelines for Students and Teachers

Guidelines for Course Managers, Supervisors, and students regarding the use of Generative AI is currently being discussed at ITU. Learning Support and Dean of Education Support invites the input of the Board of Studies, and particularly the students, in this regard.

App 2: GAI guidelines for students, teachers, and supervisors - BoS

5. AOB (Any Other Business)

Minutes

Ad 1

The agenda was approved.

Ad 2

Alaa, Emdah, and Joachim presented a project for an online platform for streamlining the process of establishing a collaboration with a supervisor for the final year's project.

They presented a number of problems with previous projects not currently accessible in one place, incomplete supervisor lists, and a perceived lack of transparency. To identify these problems, the students interviewed teachers and students.

The students then presented a WIP platform, and demonstrated how it would work.

The students expressed a wish to collaborate with ITU in the possible implementation of the platform.

Theodor asked if it would be possible to integrate the platform with LearnIT. They answered that, so far, they have not looked into possible LearnIT integrations. If ITU would find the proposed project relevant, they will check-up with LearnIT.

Ea asked if they have been in contact with SAP. They answered that they had tried but found it difficult getting to speak with someone. Ea stated that SAP owns LearnIT, so SAP would be an obvious place to discuss it. She also mentioned the Project Governance model at ITU, where projects are discussed and prioritized, as well as the fact that ITU is moving away from bespoke systems towards more standardized applications.

Ea added that, currently, negotiations are ongoing about a possible system for digital exams at ITU. This system would possibly be able to do what the proposed platform does. She stressed that the proposed project is really good and interesting, and that they should get in contact with the firm, Uniwise, about their business idea or reach out to SAP in the Spring if they wanted to be part of the project as a focus group.

Ad 3

Viktorija presented the topic, and the topic was discussed. Viktorija noted down comments from BoS members. BoS has thus been consulted on the matter.

Ad 4

Pernille presented the topic up for discussion, and that she was at the meeting to gather input towards guidelines for the use of GAI.

The document that was forwarded to BoS prior to the meetin was, among other things, inspired by what goes on at other universities, and has been in hearing with procoors, HoDs and HoSPs.

The document has already changed since the time BoS received it.

The new and revised document was shared at the meeting.

Changed included:

Explication that there are general principles about the use of GAI, general rules, specific rules for teaching and learning, as well as topics like critical thinking and ethical aspects.

The use of GAI is encouraged if it supports the ILOs.

Irina noted that the word “encourage” could maybe be considered a bit too positive or pushy. Pernille noted this.

The rules in the document should be understood as rules that lean on already existing rules about aids for exams.

Irina asked if it would be possible to implement some procedure or system that would aid in identifying whether GAI has been used to cheat an exam. If it would be possible to have even more explicit rules and guidelines.

Ea asked for ideas about how such general, but concrete, guidelines could be described. There was an open discussion about the difficulties of producing meaningful, and explicit one-size-fits-all guidelines across quite diverse study programmes. Ea added that these difficulties are the reason that the exact rules and guidelines for a particular course fall under the purview of the relevant course manager.

Magnus commented that probably we need to look at changing exam forms, rather than trying to police it excessively. A GAI “arms race” between students and teachers would not be particularly helpful.

Signe commented that it is very difficult to know exactly when, for instance, a text is written by a GAI, but that, in her experience, such texts were often of poor quality and lacked an understanding of context.

Ea mentioned that at other universities, documents such as this often have a section about “disciplinary measures” in relation to violations of rules, and that maybe this document should be linked to the pages at ITU Student about academic misconduct.

Pernille asked if there were any questions regarding the section on documentation.

Magnus stated that it seemed a little unclear when and where documentation should take place; is it running documentation throughout a report, or in a separate document? Ea replied that this would differ from one assignment to the next, depending on the particular course.

Pernille answered that the somewhat loose formulations were intended, since it is important keeping an openness towards the many different kinds of academic work, and that documentation of the use of GAI should always be done along the lines of other methods or measures that require documentation.

Irina commented that the phrasing “environmental concerns” as a subset of ethical aspects seemed like a vague way of addressing the serious concerns with the environmental footprint of using GAI. It needs to be stated more clearly.

Ea replied that probably this could be made clearer, maybe on ITU Student as well, and maybe with the help of SAP and Communications.

It was discussed if maybe the topics *confidentiality*, *environmental footprint*, and *critical thinking* should be moved forward in the document. Also, documentation would be easier understood if there were some cases where it was demonstrated how to do it.

Pernille noted the suggestions.

Ad 5

Magnus mentioned that very few students attend semester meetings. This is a shame since it is quite an important meeting. It could probably be a good idea if teachers and SAT promoted the meetings, and that promoting it was not done solely in Outlook.